DOCKET SECTION

BEFORE THE POSTAL RATE COMMISSION WASHINGTON, D.C. 20268-0001

RECEIVED

	FEB 2 15 17 198
Postal Rate and Fee Changes, 1997	Docket No. R97-1
	OFFICE CO TOO SO A DO NOT

NEWSPAPER ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA WITNESS SHARON CHOWN ANSWERS TO INTERROGATORIES OF THE NATIONAL NEWSPAPER ASSOCIATION (NNA/NAA-T1-1-6) February 11, 1998

The Newspaper Association of America hereby provides the answer of witness Sharon Chown to the interrogatories of the National Newspaper Association filed on January 28, 1998. Each interrogatory is stated verbatim and is followed by the answer. A declaration is attached.

Respectfully submitted,

NEWSPAPER ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA

Robert J. Brinkmann NEWSPAPER ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA 529 14th Street, N.W. Suite 440 Washington, D.C. (202) 638-4792 William B. Baker WILEY, REIN & FIELDING 1776 K Street, N.W.

Washington, DC 20006-2304

(202) 429-7255

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that I have this date served the instant document on all participants of record in this proceeding in accordance with section 12 of the Rules of Practice.

February 11, 1998

NNA/NAA-T1-1. Please examine Footnote 1 on page 2 of your testimony where it is stated..."[I]nstitutional costs incurred to provide a particular function should be paid by the subclasses of mail that use that function." Do you consider these "institutional costs" to be service-related costs? If not, please explain the difference between your metric and service-related costs.

Answer:

No. My proposal has nothing to do with "service-related costs."

The term "service-related costs" has been used in past proceedings to refer to "the fixed delivery costs that could be saved in the absence of published delivery standards for the preferential classes."

(Opinion and Recommended Decision, Docket No. R84-1, ¶ 3057) In Dockets No. R77-1 and R80-1, the Commission "attributed" these service-related costs to the preferential classes of mail that were thought to cause these costs.

Unlike service-related cost proposals, I am not proposing to attribute any institutional costs to particular subclasses of mail.

NNA/NAA-T1-2. Please state whether you consider weighted attributable costs to be a part of the "direct or indirect postal costs attributable" to a mail class that the Commission is required to consider under 39 U.S.C. § 3622 (b)(3). Please explain your answer fully.

Answer:

My weighted attributable costs are not a substitute for the actual attributable costs to be recovered from a subclass of mail, as required by 39 U.S.C. § 3622 (b)(3). I propose weighted attributable costs as a metric for assigning institutional costs only, not as a new attribution methodology. The institutional cost contribution determined by the Commission using this approach would then be added to the actual (unweighted) attributable costs to arrive at the revenues for a subclass. Please see my answers to UPS/NAA-T1-1, ADVO/NAA-T1-6(a), and ADVO/NAA-T1-7(d).

NNA/NAA-T1-3. If your answer to Interrogatory No. 2 is *yes*, please state whether you believe a failure to consider weighted attributable costs as the basis for a markup could lead the Commission to approving below-cost rates for a subclass with a small markup.

Answer:

Not applicable. As explained in my response to NNA/NAA-T1-2, I recommend that the Commission use weighted attributable costs for the assignment of institutional costs *only*. As long as the revenues for a subclass exceed its actual (unweighted) attributable costs, the subclass will make a positive contribution to the institutional costs of the Postal Service.

NNA/NAA-T1-4. If your answer to Interrogatory No. 3 is yes, please state whether you are recommending that weighted attributable costs as you define them should be considered incremental costs by the Commission.

Answer:

Not applicable. Please see my response to NNA/NAA-T1-2.

NNA/NAA-T1-5. Please examine the chart attached to this interrogatory and labeled "Table 1. Comparison of Attributable Cost and Weighted Attributable Cost." Please confirm that the markup proposed in your testimony would result in an increase in institutional costs for within-county mail from \$2.385 million to \$3.666 million. If you do not confirm, please explain why and provide the percentage increase in markup that you are proposing for within-county and regular rate periodicals.

Answer:

Not confirmed. I do not propose any specific markups in my direct testimony.

Nor do I propose a specific dollar amount of institutional cost contribution for any subclass of mail. I simply provide a better metric to which the Commission can apply its judgment to determine the appropriate institutional cost contributions.

The increase in institutional costs for within-county mail shown in your chart results from applying the *Postal Service's* proposed markups to my weighted attributable costs. This is not my recommendation.

Table 1. Comparison of Attributable Cost and Weighted Attributable Cost (Dollars in Thousands)

Chown Method USPS Markups Based Upon Attributable Costs **USPS Markups Based Upon Weighted Costs** Institutional Cost Based Upon USPS Markup Weighted Attributable Attributable **Incitivational** Attributable institutional Cast Cost Coats Coat Cinco & Subcines Markup Markup Cost Cost Markup First-Class Mail \$12,750,064 \$9,390,095 73.6% \$11,868,345 \$9,390,095 79.0% Single Letters \$11,888,345 \$8,749,559 73.6% Worksharing Letters 4.047.004 7.418.926 163.3% 4 566,704 7 418 926 162 5% 4.566.704 8,371,469 183 3% **Total Letters** 16,806,748 16,809,021 100.0% 16,455,049 16,809,021 102.2% 16,455,049 16,458,254 100 0% 228.751 Single Postcards 432,261 228,751 52.9% 500.482 45.7% 500.482 52 9% 264,853 167.3% 196,045 267.843 Worksharing Postcards 188,123 267.843 136.6% 196.045 327.931 167 3% **Total Cards** 502,364 494,594 83.8% 696,527 496.504 71.3% 696.527 583 897 83 8% 17,300,132 Total 17,305,615 99.5% 17.151.576 17,305,615 100.9% 17,151,576 17,060,370 99.5% **Priority Mail** 2,200,217 2,000,476 92.1% 1.343.433 2,006,476 155.3% 1,343,833 1,237,249 92 1% 433,188 Express Mail 410.564 430.652 104.9% 430,652 99.4% 433,188 454.383 104 9% 820.5% 492.7% Mailgrams 500 4,168 846 4.168 846 6.941 820.5% 1.0163 **Periodicals** in County 81,360 2,305 2.8% 129,401 2,305 1.8% 129,401 3.666 28% 366,816 11,160 3.0% 366.816 331.471 11,160 3.4% 12.350 3 4% Nonorolit -2.215 -18 9% 11,736 -17 4% Classroom 12,755 -2.215-17.4% 11,736 -2.0381.567,121 111.057 7.1% 1 567 121 110 299 Regular-Rate 1,577,889 111,057 7.0% 7.0% 2,075,074 126,678 2.003,475 122,307 6.1% 2,075,074 122,307 5.9% 61% Total Standard Mail A -100.0% 0 204 N.A. O -100 0% Single Piece -298 298 5.754.017 2.830.371 49.2% 5.754.017 3,136,946 54 5% 5,191,674 2.830.371 54.5% Commercial Regular 128.3% 3 111 033 2.418.756 77.7% 3.111.033 3.991.427 128 3% Commercial ECR 1.885,248 2,418,756 59.2% 8,576,076 5.249.425 8,865,050 74 2% **Total Commercial** 7.078.824 6,249,425 74.2% 8,866,050 20.2% 1.207.983 266.918 22.1% 22.1% 1.207.983 244,328 1.107.106 244,328 Nonorofit 60 9% 76.267 41.1% 185.779 113 196 81.0% 185,779 125,121 76,247 Nonorofit ECR 362.645 26.0% 1,232,226 320,615 26.0% 1.393,762 320,615 23.0% 1,393,762 **Total Nonorofit** 6.877,245 10,258,813 5.570.040 54.3% 10.258.813 67.0% Total Standard Mail A 4,308,860 5,570,040 67.0% Standard Mail B 5.6% 531.757 20.886 3 9% 753 327 29.589 3.9% 531,757 29.589 Parcel Post 50.7% 352.471 181,928 352.471 178,595 51 6% 346.013 178,595 51.6% **Bound Printed Matter** 43.2% 221.143 82,195 37 2% 95.470 256,860 95,470 37 2% 221,143 **Special Rate** 2.562 6 8% 6.8% 37.623 3.342 8 9% 37.623 3.342 49.065 Library Rate 21.8% 249,696 1.142,983 306.996 26.9% 1.142.993 1,405,285 306,996 21.8% Total 27,521 -27.521 -100 0% -100.0% 27.521 -31.757-115.4% 31,757 -31,757 Free-for-the-Blind, etc. 211.547 36 3% 75 1% 582,742 437,814 1.206.030 437,814 36.3% 582,742 International Mail 773 224 59 5% 764,752 58.9% 1.299.087 1,299,087 1,284,854 764,752 59.5% Special Services 26,969,813 78.6% 34,316,672 26,997,063 78.7% 34.315.672 34,315,672 26,907,063 78.7% **Total Cost**

NAA-1A at 5

NAA-1E

3NAA-1D

NNA/NAA-T1-6. For the purpose of this interrogatory, please assume: (1) a law requires that the markup on Class B be equal to one half of the markup on Class A; (2) Class A's markup, stated as a percentage of attributable costs, is 10 percent; and, (3) Class A's markup, stated as a percentage of weighted attributable costs, is 6 percent. What should be the markup on Class B? Please state the markup as a percentage of attributable cost or as a percentage of weighted attributable cost and explain your answer.

Answer:

In your question, if the law defines markup as the percentage of institutional cost contribution relative to actual (unweighted) attributable costs, then Class B's markup should be 5 percent of its actual (unweighted) attributable costs. See also my answers to DMA/NAA-T1-6 and VP-CW/NAA-T1-10.

DECLARATION

I, Sharon L. Chown, declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing answers are true and correct, to the best of my knowledge, information and belief.

120

Date: 1- Sunay 11, 1992